## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are pending in the present application. No amendment has been proposed. It is respectfully submitted that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated April 4, 2006.

## As to the Merits:

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejections:

- 1) claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Shintani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,546); and
- 2) claims 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintani et al.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 calls for, inter alia, a first channel searching means for tuning in to the broadcasting channels in a predetermined order using the first digital receiving unit, ...; second channel searching means for tuning in to the broadcasting channels in an order opposite to the first channel searching means using the second digital receiving unit, ..., each of the

Attorney Docket No. 042300

channel searching means comprising means for judging, when a search for the subsequent

channel is started, whether or not the receivable channel information or the information

indicating that receiving is impossible is stored in the channel map with respect to the

subsequent channel. Independent claim 4 is drawn to a similar embodiment.

The applied reference of Shintani discloses an autoprogrammer for a television receiver

capable of receiving conventional analog (NTSC) channels and DTV (8VSB) channels. In

Shintani, conventional analog channels are identified and then skip channel data for each of the

channels is stored in a memory. Subsequently, DTV channels are identified and then skip

channel data for each identified DTV channels is entered in the memory.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Shintani fails to disclose or fairly suggest that

the search for the DTV channels is conducted in an order opposite from the search of the

conventional analog (NTSC) channels. Instead, as clearly shown in steps 64-74 and 88-92 of the

flowchart in Fig. 6 of Shintani, the channel searches for the conventional analog (NTSC)

channels and the DTV (8VSB) channels are conducted in the same order from the lowest channel

to the highest channel.

In addition, it is submitted that during the search of the conventional analog (NTSC)

channels in steps 64-76, Shintani fails to judge when a search for a subsequent channel is started,

Page 3

whether or not the receivable channel information or the information indicating that receiving is

impossible is stored in the channel map with respect to the subsequent channel, as specifically

called for in claim 1.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Shintani fails to disclose or fairly suggest the

features of claim 1 concerning a first channel searching means for tuning in to the broadcasting

channels in a predetermined order using the first digital receiving unit, ...;

second channel searching means for tuning in to the broadcasting channels in an order opposite

to the first channel searching means using the second digital receiving unit, ..., each of the

channel searching means comprising means for judging, when a search for the subsequent

channel is started, whether or not the receivable channel information or the information

indicating that receiving is impossible is stored in the channel map with respect to the

subsequent channel.

Further, with regard to dependent claims 2 and 5, it is submitted that the Examiner has

failed to appreciate that according to each of these claims the first and second channel searches

are conducted in ascending and descending order of their frequencies, respectively. As such, it is

submitted that the Official Notice taken by the Examiner regarding searching channels in a

television receiver in either ascending or descending order fails to address the feature concerning

Page 4

Response

Application No. 10/656,247

Attorney Docket No. 042300

conducting the first and second channel searches in ascending and descending order of their

frequencies, respectively, as set forth in each of claims 2 and 5.

In view of the aforementioned remarks, Applicant submits that the claims are in condition

for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate

extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect

to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DAMELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Thomas E. Brown

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 44,450

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/jl

Page 5